Justice in Conflict: Legal Accountability and Moral Responsibility in the Israel-Palestine War Crimes Debate

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

May 10, 2025

This paper explores the complex and often polarizing landscape of international legal accountability surrounding alleged war crimes in the Israel-Palestine conflict. As global attention intensifies on military conduct in Gaza, the West Bank, and surrounding areas, questions of legality, morality, and due process come sharply into focus. We examine the foundational laws that define war crimes, the international and national bodies that claim jurisdiction, and the numerous non-governmental organizations engaged in both documenting violations and defending the accused. The paper also considers the moral and ethical dimensions of justice—how law intersects with conscience, duty, and reconciliation. Central to this inquiry is the principle that no one is above the law, but that every individual, including soldiers and commanders, deserves a fair trial and legal representation. By mapping these interlocking systems of accountability, advocacy, and defense, we aim to offer a clear and balanced perspective on one of the most urgent and emotionally charged legal issues of our time.

Keywords: Israel, Palestine, war crimes, IDF, international law, ICC, ICJ, Gaza, West Bank, human rights, Geneva Conventions, Rome Statute, military ethics, legal defense, universal jurisdiction, documentation, B'Tselem, Al-Haq, Human Rights Watch, Shurat HaDin, accountability, reconciliation, due process, unlawful orders, international humanitarian law. A collaboration with GPT-4o. CC4.0.

I. Introduction

The enduring conflict between Israel and Palestine represents one of the most contentious and polarizing geopolitical issues in the modern era. At its core lies a complex matrix of history, religion, security, displacement, and political ambition. However, beyond the political and ideological disputes, the sheer human toll—particularly on civilians—has compelled the international community to examine actions within this conflict through the lens of international humanitarian law. Allegations of war crimes, whether by the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) or by other actors, have generated intense scrutiny, legal challenges, and calls for accountability.

As warfare has evolved, so too has the framework for documenting, adjudicating, and responding to actions considered crimes under international law. No longer is impunity the default; instead, multiple international and national bodies have jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute war crimes. At the same time, a robust defense mechanism is necessary to protect the rights of those accused—ensuring fair trials, preventing political manipulation of legal systems, and upholding the rule of law.

This paper aims to provide a clear and structured overview of the key organizations involved in both documenting and defending against allegations of war crimes within the Israel-Palestine context. It will explore the legal foundations that define war crimes, the jurisdictional reach of various tribunals and courts, and the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that engage in advocacy, investigation, and legal support on all sides. Importantly, the paper also addresses the moral and ethical implications of prosecution and defense, including avenues for reconciliation that may extend beyond traditional legal frameworks.

In doing so, the paper seeks not to pass judgment, but to map the terrain of international justice—offering insight into how global legal systems interact with deeply rooted conflict. Understanding these mechanisms is not only vital for policymakers and legal professionals, but also for citizens and observers who care about justice, due process, and the possibility of peace.

II. Legal Foundations of War Crime Jurisdiction

The concept of war crimes is rooted in the broader framework of international humanitarian law (IHL), which seeks to regulate the conduct of armed conflict and protect individuals who are not participating in hostilities. The legal foundations of war crimes are established primarily through international treaties, customary international law, and the judgments of international tribunals. Understanding these foundations is essential for analyzing both the mechanisms of accountability and the legal defenses available to those accused.

A. Defining War Crimes

War crimes refer to serious violations of the laws and customs of war that incur individual criminal responsibility. These include:

- Willful killing or targeting of civilians
- Torture or inhuman treatment
- Destruction of property not justified by military necessity
- Unlawful deportation or confinement
- Using civilians as human shields
- Attacking medical or humanitarian personnel

The legal definition is codified in several instruments, most notably the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998) and the Geneva Conventions (1949) and their Additional Protocols. These frameworks distinguish war crimes from other international crimes such as genocide and crimes against humanity, though overlaps can occur.

B. Sources of Legal Authority

1. The Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols
   Adopted after World War II, these conventions form the bedrock of IHL and explicitly prohibit attacks on civilians and the use of disproportionate force.

- Fourth Geneva Convention: Especially relevant in the context of military occupation and civilian protection.

2. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court
   The Rome Statute not only defines war crimes but also establishes procedures for investigating and prosecuting them. It introduces:
   - The principle of complementarity (national courts take precedence if willing and able)
   - The ability to prosecute both state and non-state actors
3. Customary International Law
   Many war crimes norms are considered binding on all states, regardless of treaty ratification, due to their status as customary law developed through state practice and opinio juris (belief in legal obligation).
4. UN Security Council Resolutions
   Under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the Security Council can refer cases to the ICC and authorize ad hoc tribunals.

C. Principles of Jurisdiction

- Territorial Jurisdiction: War crimes committed in a particular territory fall under that state's jurisdiction.
- Nationality Jurisdiction: A state can prosecute its nationals or those who committed crimes against its nationals.
- Universal Jurisdiction: Certain crimes, such as genocide and war crimes, are so egregious that any state can claim jurisdiction, regardless of where the crime occurred.
- Complementarity and ICC: If domestic courts are unwilling or unable to prosecute, the ICC may assume jurisdiction over the case.

III. Key Jurisdictional Bodies

To ensure accountability for war crimes and other serious violations of international law, a range of judicial and quasi-judicial institutions have been established. These bodies vary in their mandates, jurisdictional scope, and enforcement capacity. In the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict, multiple entities—international, regional, and national—play a role in investigating or adjudicating alleged war crimes. This section outlines the primary institutions with jurisdiction over such matters.

A. International Criminal Court (ICC)

Location: The Hague, Netherlands
Established: 2002 under the Rome Statute
Jurisdiction:

- War crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and the crime of aggression
- Jurisdiction over crimes committed on the territory of States Parties or by nationals of States Parties

Relevance to Israel-Palestine:

- Palestine acceded to the Rome Statute in 2015, granting the ICC jurisdiction over alleged crimes committed in Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem.
- While Israel is not a party to the Rome Statute, the ICC has asserted jurisdiction based on Palestine's membership.
- The ICC Prosecutor has opened an investigation into the situation in Palestine, covering actions by both Israeli and Palestinian actors since June 13, 2014.

B. International Court of Justice (ICJ)

Location: The Hague, Netherlands
Established: 1945 as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations
Jurisdiction:

- Adjudicates legal disputes between states
- Issues advisory opinions on legal questions referred by UN bodies

Relevance to Israel-Palestine:

- South Africa's 2023–2024 case against Israel accuses it of violating the Genocide Convention in Gaza.
- The ICJ cannot prosecute individuals but can shape international legal norms and influence state behavior through rulings and provisional measures.

C. UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) and Commissions of Inquiry

Function: Investigative and advisory, not judicial
Mechanism:

- Mandated to investigate human rights violations and violations of international humanitarian law
- Produces public reports that may be used by judicial bodies such as the ICC

Relevance:

- The UNHRC has repeatedly authorized investigations into Israeli military operations in Palestinian territories.
- Findings have included allegations of disproportionate force and targeting of civilians.

D. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

Function: Monitors and reports on human rights violations
Mandate:

- Collects data from conflict zones
- Engages in advocacy, technical assistance, and legal recommendations

Relevance:

- OHCHR regularly issues updates on the situation in Gaza and the West Bank
- Its reports are often referenced by other legal or political bodies

---

E. National Courts Exercising Universal Jurisdiction

Examples: Germany, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands
Basis: National legislation enabling prosecution of serious international crimes regardless of where they occurred or the nationality of the accused
Relevance:

- Several European courts have received complaints against Israeli officials for alleged war crimes
- These cases often face political challenges but have set important legal precedents

---

F. Ad Hoc or Special Tribunals (Hypothetical in This Context)

Though no special tribunal currently exists for Israel-Palestine, such bodies have been created in other contexts (e.g., the ICTY for Yugoslavia, ICTR for Rwanda). Calls have been made for a tribunal on Israel-Palestine, but no consensus has been reached.

IV. Organizations Documenting Alleged IDF War Crimes

In zones of protracted conflict, documentation is essential for establishing legal accountability, historical memory, and human rights advocacy. In the Israel-Palestine context, numerous non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international institutions, and legal advocacy groups have worked to gather evidence of alleged war crimes by the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). Their efforts contribute to international legal proceedings, pressuring states and multilateral institutions to act, and raising public awareness about the human cost of military operations.

Below is a survey of key organizations engaged in documentation, field investigation, and legal advocacy related to alleged war crimes by the IDF.

A. B'Tselem – The Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories

Founded: 1989
Based in: Jerusalem
Focus: Israeli human rights organization dedicated to documenting violations in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem.
Activities:

- Field research, testimonies, and photographic evidence
- Reporting on extrajudicial killings, house demolitions, settler violence, and military operations
- Advocacy before Israeli and international audiences
  Notable Position: In 2021, B'Tselem formally described Israeli control over Palestinians as an apartheid regime.

B. Palestinian Centre for Human Rights (PCHR)

Founded: 1995
Based in: Gaza City
Focus: Legal aid, monitoring of military actions, and public reporting on human rights violations.
Activities:

- Field investigation of airstrikes, detentions, and civilian deaths
- Submits legal complaints to Israeli and international bodies
- Advocates for victims' rights under international law
  Legal Orientation: Frames cases using international humanitarian and criminal law.

C. Al-Haq

Founded: 1979
Based in: Ramallah, West Bank
Focus: Documenting human rights violations and conducting legal research and litigation.
Activities:

- Collection of evidence for war crimes prosecution
- Submission of legal files to the International Criminal Court (ICC)
- Collaboration with international human rights networks
  Notable Cases: Participated in efforts to halt arms sales to Israel on legal grounds.

D. Amnesty International

Founded: 1961
Global NGO with country offices
Focus: Investigation and reporting on human rights abuses worldwide.
Activities:

- Independent reports on specific military operations in Gaza
- Documentation of indiscriminate attacks and civilian casualties
  Key Reports:
- 2023: Described Israeli attacks that “wiped out entire families” in Gaza as possible war crimes
- 2022: Issued a controversial report labeling Israeli policy toward Palestinians as apartheid

---

E. Human Rights Watch (HRW)

Founded: 1978
Based in: New York, USA
Focus: Global human rights monitoring and legal advocacy.
Activities:

- Satellite imagery analysis and field interviews
- Reports on IDF conduct, including alleged use of white phosphorus and unlawful airstrikes
  Notable Statements: HRW has formally stated that Israel is committing crimes against humanity, including apartheid.

F. United Nations Commissions of Inquiry

Mandated by: UN Human Rights Council
Function: Independent fact-finding missions
Activities:

- Collect evidence on all parties to the conflict
- Publish reports on civilian deaths, military conduct, and violations of international law
  Latest Mandate: Includes investigation of events following October 7, 2023, with authority to collect material for potential criminal proceedings.

G. Hind Rajab Foundation (HRF)

Founded: 2024
Based in: Brussels
Focus: Legal representation and documentation for Palestinian victims
Activities:

- Prepares case files for universal jurisdiction lawsuits
- Engages with international courts on behalf of affected families
  Unique Role: Seeks criminal prosecution of specific IDF personnel by invoking universal jurisdiction laws in European states.

These organizations vary in their methods, reach, and orientation—some focus on legal outcomes, while others center on public awareness or grassroots advocacy. Together, they form a comprehensive ecosystem for documenting alleged violations and seeking justice.

V. Legal and Humanitarian Defense for the Accused

While international law rightly emphasizes the investigation and prosecution of war crimes, it also upholds the right to a fair trial, due process, and legal defense for anyone accused of such crimes. This includes members of the IDF who may face allegations arising from operations in Gaza, the West Bank, or other occupied territories. Legal defense is not only a human right but also a fundamental requirement of the legitimacy of any judicial process. In parallel, humanitarian and faith-based organizations may support the moral and spiritual needs of the accused, especially in complex cases involving political or ideological conflict.

This section outlines the entities and frameworks that provide support for accused individuals, including legal defense NGOs, humanitarian organizations, and legal firms.

A. Legal Defense NGOs

1. Shurat HaDin – Israel Law Center

- Role: Israeli NGO that defends Israeli officials and soldiers from war crimes accusations.
- Methods: Legal representation, strategic litigation, counter-lawsuits, and public campaigns.
- Notable Focus: Argues that Israeli military operations are lawful acts of self-defense against terrorism.

2. Honenu

- Role: Legal aid organization for Israeli soldiers, security personnel, and civilians accused of security-related offenses.
- Services: Court representation, legal advice, funding appeals, and advocacy.
- Perspective: Nationalist and often supportive of settler communities in the West Bank.

3. International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists (IAJLJ)

- Role: Provides legal advocacy and guidance to Jewish individuals facing international prosecution.
- Activities: Submits legal opinions, defends accused individuals, and challenges international proceedings deemed politically motivated.

4. The Jerusalem Institute of Justice (JIJ)

- Role: A legal think tank defending Israeli sovereignty and promoting legal clarity in the interpretation of humanitarian law.
- Work: Prepares amicus briefs, defends soldiers, and counters allegations of apartheid or genocide.

B. Private Legal Defense and International Law Firms

Individuals accused of war crimes may also retain private international criminal law firms, many of which specialize in defending clients in front of the ICC, ICJ, or national courts operating under universal jurisdiction.

- Examples:
    - Guernica 37 International Justice Chambers
    - Doughty Street Chambers
    - Debevoise & Plimpton (Human Rights and International Law Practice)
- Services include:
    - Strategic legal defense
    - Appeals and jurisdictional challenges
    - Humanitarian law analysis

C. Humanitarian and Rights-Based Organizations

1. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

- Mandate: Neutral and impartial; ensures detainees' rights are protected regardless of charges.
- Activities:
    - Monitoring detention conditions
    - Verifying legal access
    - Ensuring compliance with Geneva Conventions

2. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

- Function: Protects individuals facing persecution or unfair trial, including former military personnel.
- Relevance: In rare cases, individuals accused of war crimes may claim asylum if they risk political persecution or unfair trial in the accusing state.

D. Ethical, Moral, and Faith-Based Support

In deeply charged conflicts, some individuals—whether guilty or not—may seek reconciliation, repentance, or spiritual guidance. While less formal than legal proceedings, these efforts can be meaningful:

- Faith-Based Mediation Networks – Provide spiritual support, confession, or moral guidance.
- Restorative Justice Models – In theory, allow perpetrators and victims to engage in structured dialogues for healing and accountability, though rarely applied in wartime.

E. The Principle of Due Process

Finally, all of these efforts are bound by the fundamental principles of international justice:

- Presumption of innocence
- Right to legal representation
- Access to evidence and appeal
- Protection from politically motivated prosecutions

These guarantees are essential not only for fairness but to maintain credibility in the broader quest for justice.

VI. Ethical and Reconciliation Dimensions

War crimes adjudication is often framed in terms of legality, evidence, and procedural justice. Yet beneath the legal architecture lies a deeper ethical terrain: questions of moral responsibility, collective trauma, truth, and the possibility of reconciliation. Especially in the Israel-Palestine conflict—where historical narratives, religious identities, and existential fears shape every facet of perception—legal processes alone cannot address the full human dimensions of wrongdoing and suffering. This section explores those moral layers, including the roles of conscience, repentance, and alternative forms of justice that complement formal prosecution and defense.

A. The Morality of War and the Right to Defense

International humanitarian law is rooted in a paradox: it accepts war as a reality while trying to humanize it. Under this structure:

- Soldiers are permitted to use force, but only within strict limits.
- Violations, such as targeting civilians, are crimes—but the circumstances are often morally ambiguous, especially in asymmetric warfare.

- Ethical questions emerge: *What is proportional force? Who is a combatant? What constitutes necessity?*

Legal defense must thus be paired with moral discernment, recognizing that human error, command structure pressure, and misjudgment coexist with willful brutality in any war.

B. The Problem of Collective Guilt

- Critics often apply moral judgments collectively to groups (e.g., "the IDF," "Palestinians"), bypassing individual accountability.
- International law emphasizes individual criminal responsibility, rejecting the idea of inherited or group guilt.
- However, public opinion, media narratives, and national ideologies frequently impose blanket moral condemnation or absolution, complicating efforts toward genuine justice.

C. Truth and Reconciliation: A Missing Element

Some nations have used truth and reconciliation commissions (TRCs) to address mass atrocities, such as South Africa post-apartheid or Rwanda after genocide. These mechanisms:

- Allow perpetrators to confess in exchange for leniency
- Provide victims a platform for their stories
- Seek restorative justice over retributive justice

In the Israel-Palestine context:

- No formal TRC exists
- The political climate remains hostile to mutual recognition

- Yet, grassroots organizations and faith-based leaders have initiated local dialogue efforts, memorial projects, and interfaith campaigns

---

D. Spiritual Responses to War Crime Allegations

For some accused individuals, especially those raised within religious traditions, facing allegations of war crimes becomes a moral and spiritual crisis:

- Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all contain theological resources on repentance (*teshuvah*, *tawba*, confession), mercy, and forgiveness
- Religious leaders have sometimes advocated for moral reckoning, even when legal guilt is contested
- Faith-based initiatives (e.g., Moral Injury Programs for soldiers, religious mediation) offer frameworks for healing that legal trials cannot fully provide

---

E. Toward a Culture of Accountability and Mercy

Justice must be impartial, but it must also be human. In the long term:

- Reconciliation requires acknowledgment, not just punishment
- Moral growth among accused individuals should be encouraged—not suppressed by politicized defenses or denial
- Victims must be heard, and offenders given the opportunity to change

True justice may ultimately rest not only in verdicts and sentences, but in the ability of individuals and societies to confront truth, accept moral responsibility, and pursue peace.

VII. Case Studies

While theoretical frameworks and legal structures provide important context, the application of international law becomes most visible through real-world cases.

The following case studies illustrate how allegations of war crimes involving the IDF have been approached by various legal bodies. These examples highlight the tension between state sovereignty, international accountability, and the rights of the accused.

A. The International Criminal Court (ICC) Investigation into Palestine (2015–Present)

Background:
After Palestine was granted observer state status by the United Nations in 2012, it acceded to the Rome Statute in 2015. This allowed the ICC to claim jurisdiction over alleged crimes committed in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem.

Key Allegations:

- Unlawful killings of civilians during IDF operations, including during the 2014 Gaza War (Operation Protective Edge)
- Expansion of Israeli settlements, considered a war crime under Article 8(2)(b)(viii) of the Rome Statute
- Palestinian armed group actions were also included, such as rocket attacks on Israeli civilians

Status:
The ICC formally opened an investigation in 2021. While proceedings have moved slowly due to political pressure and jurisdictional debates, the investigation remains active.

Significance:

- First time the ICC has investigated a Western-backed military force in a sustained way
- Israel has refused cooperation, arguing the court lacks jurisdiction
- Palestinian groups have submitted extensive documentation through NGOs such as Al-Haq and PCHR

B. South Africa v. Israel at the International Court of Justice (2023–2025)

Background:
In response to Israeli military actions in Gaza following the October 7, 2023 Hamas attack, South Africa filed a case at the ICJ alleging Israel was committing genocide.

Claims:

- Violation of the Genocide Convention (1948)
- Intent to destroy part of the Palestinian population through indiscriminate bombing, deprivation of aid, and forced displacement

Legal Mechanism:

- The ICJ does not prosecute individuals, but rules on inter-state disputes
- South Africa requested provisional measures to halt Israeli military operations

Status:
The ICJ issued interim measures ordering Israel to prevent genocidal acts and ensure humanitarian aid access, but stopped short of ordering an immediate ceasefire. The case remains under review.

Significance:

- Intensified global legal scrutiny of Israeli conduct
- Marked a shift in how Global South countries use international law to challenge Western-aligned powers

---

C. Universal Jurisdiction Cases in Europe

Example: Belgium and the Netherlands, 2023–2024
Background:
NGOs filed complaints in European courts against Israeli officials for war crimes, invoking national laws that permit universal jurisdiction over grave breaches of international law.

Legal Basis:

- Geneva Conventions
- National war crimes statutes (e.g., Belgium's 1993 Law on Grave Breaches)

Defendants:
Former and current Israeli political and military leaders

Challenges:

- Political pressure from Israel and its allies
- Difficulty securing physical presence of defendants
- Legal ambiguity over diplomatic immunity

Outcomes:

- Some cases were dismissed; others remain under preliminary investigation
- Raised international awareness and influenced public discourse

---

D. UN Human Rights Council Reports on Operation Cast Lead and Protective Edge

Operation Cast Lead (2008–2009)

- UN Fact-Finding Mission led by Justice Richard Goldstone
- Report alleged both Israeli and Hamas war crimes
- Israel rejected findings; Goldstone later retracted parts of the report

Operation Protective Edge (2014)

- UN Commission of Inquiry found credible allegations of disproportionate force and civilian targeting
- Recommendations included potential ICC referral

Significance:

- Contributed to formal legal discourse
- Served as sources for ICC filings and NGO legal briefs
- Highlighted challenges of neutral reporting in a highly politicized environment

---

These case studies reveal a common theme: the interplay between law, politics, and perception. Even when legal institutions act independently, their legitimacy is often challenged by states and publics aligned with either side. Yet despite these tensions, international mechanisms persist in their role as watchdogs, forums for justice, and tools for accountability.

VIII. Military Doctrine and the Duty to Disobey Unlawful Orders

Modern military ethics and international law both affirm a critical principle: a soldier is legally obligated to disobey an order that constitutes a war crime. While military discipline is built on the chain of command, this obligation introduces a moral and legal boundary that overrides obedience when an order violates international humanitarian law.

A. Legal Foundations of the Duty to Disobey

The duty to refuse unlawful orders is enshrined in several legal instruments:

- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Article 33):
  A person is not relieved of criminal responsibility if an order to commit a crime was manifestly unlawful.
- Geneva Conventions (Common Article 1):
  All parties must respect and ensure respect for the Conventions in all circumstances, implying individual responsibility.

- Nuremberg Principles (Principle IV):
  Following orders does not absolve individuals from responsibility if a moral choice was possible.

This legal principle arose from the post-WWII Nuremberg Trials, where the defense of *"just following orders"* was rejected when crimes against humanity were committed.

B. Israeli Military Law and Ethical Code

The Israel Defense Forces (IDF) explicitly incorporates this duty into its internal legal framework:

- IDF Ethical Code ("The Spirit of the IDF"):
  - Emphasizes purity of arms and human dignity
  - Requires soldiers to refrain from carrying out manifestly illegal orders
- Yoram Dinstein Standard (Israeli Supreme Court):
  - Defined a "manifestly illegal order" as one that "pierces the eye and revolts the heart"
- Military Law:
  - Soldiers are trained to identify unlawful orders and are instructed to refuse them, with legal backing for doing so

---

C. Challenges in Practice

Despite clear doctrine, disobeying an order is rarely simple:

- Fear of reprisal or punishment by superiors
- Unclear battlefield conditions, where legality is not immediately evident
- Moral pressure to act in solidarity with one's unit or country

- Ambiguity in interpreting “military necessity” vs. “disproportionate force”

Nevertheless, international tribunals have consistently ruled that a soldier who knowingly carries out a war crime cannot invoke superior orders as a defense.

D. Implications for Command Responsibility

- Military commanders can be held liable if they issue illegal orders or fail to prevent them.
- Conversely, lower-ranking soldiers may reduce liability by showing they refused unlawful commands and reported them through proper channels.

E. Reinforcing Accountability

Military systems must:

- Train soldiers in international humanitarian law
- Provide whistleblower protections for those who report illegal orders
- Build a culture where moral courage is valued alongside obedience

This principle is central not only to legal justice but to restoring the moral legitimacy of military institutions operating under democratic rule.

IX. Conclusion

The pursuit of justice in the midst of ongoing conflict is never simple. In the case of Israel and Palestine, allegations of war crimes against the IDF exist alongside deep fears, contested histories, and political weaponization of legal frameworks. Nevertheless, the international legal order—through courts, commissions, treaties, and principles—seeks to create a space where accountability can be pursued, truth can be uncovered, and victims can be heard.

This paper has mapped the architecture of that effort: the legal foundations that define war crimes, the international and national bodies empowered to investigate and adjudicate them, and the organizations that gather evidence or offer defense. It has shown that justice is not the province of any one side, but a universal ideal that must apply equally to accused and accuser. The rule of law demands not only investigation and prosecution, but also procedural fairness, due process, and moral reflection.

Importantly, we have also considered the deeper ethical and spiritual dimensions. These emerge in the call for reconciliation, the moral burden carried by soldiers, and the duty to disobey unlawful orders. Justice, in the fullest sense, is not only about punishment—it is also about truth, repentance, and the possibility of healing. Without addressing these layers, legal proceedings risk becoming hollow or performative.

In a conflict where every act is viewed through lenses of trauma, survival, and historical grievance, the work of documentation, defense, and judgment must be handled with sobriety, clarity, and humility. If international justice is to mean anything, it must protect the innocent, restrain the powerful, and offer pathways to redemption for those willing to confront their actions.

Only then can justice serve not as a tool for vengeance or denial, but as a foundation for peace.

X. References

Amnesty International. (2023). *Damning evidence of war crimes as Israeli attacks wipe out entire families in Gaza*. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2023/10/damning-evidence-of-war-crimes-as-israeli-attacks-wipe-out-entire-families-in-gaza/

B'Tselem. (2021). *A regime of Jewish supremacy from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea: This is apartheid*. https://www.btselem.org/publications/fulltext/202101_this_is_apartheid

Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols. International Committee of the Red Cross. https://www.icrc.org/en/war-and-law/treaties-customary-law/geneva-conventions

Goldstone, R. (2009). *Report of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict*. United Nations Human Rights Council. https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/special-missions/ffm-gaza-2009

Human Rights Watch. (2021). *A Threshold Crossed: Israeli Authorities and the Crimes of Apartheid and Persecution*. https://www.hrw.org/report/2021/04/27/threshold-crossed/israeli-authorities-and-crimes-apartheid-and-persecution

International Criminal Court. (1998). *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*. https://www.icc-cpi.int/resource-library/documents/rs-eng.pdf

International Court of Justice. (2024). *Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel)* – Order on Provisional Measures. https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192

International Committee of the Red Cross. (n.d.). *The obligation to disobey manifestly unlawful orders*. https://www.icrc.org/en/document/international-humanitarian-law-and-duty-disobey-unlawful-orders

Jerusalem Institute of Justice. (n.d.). *Advocacy and legal defense initiatives*. https://jij.org

Palestinian Centre for Human Rights. (2023). *Annual Report on Human Rights Violations in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. https://www.pchrgaza.org

Shurat HaDin – Israel Law Center. (n.d.). *Defending Israel against war crimes accusations*. https://israellawcenter.org

South African Government. (2023). *Application instituting proceedings against Israel at the International Court of Justice*. https://www.dirco.gov.za

United Nations Human Rights Council. (2021–2024). *Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel*. https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-israel/index

Yoram Dinstein. (2004). *The Conduct of Hostilities under the Law of International Armed Conflict*. Cambridge University Press.

JUSTICE IN CONFLICT
Legal Accountability and Moral Responsibility in the Israel-Palestine War Crimes Debate